REMARKS

Claims 1-13 and 18-21 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 2, 11-13, 15, 16 and 18-21 are amended. Support for amended claims 2, 11, 12, 15, 18 and 20 can be found, for example, on page 26, lines 9-16, page 37, line 16 - page 38, line 3, and page 38, lines 16-17, of the specification. Support for amended claims 13, 16 and 21 can be found, for example, on page 26, lines 9-16, of the specification. Claims 14 and 17 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited in those claims. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,119,147 to Toomey et al. (hereinafter "Toomey") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,583,808 to Boulanger et al. (hereinafter "Boulanger"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 19 recite, among other features, relating the activity event detected to time for each object during which each object conducts the detected activity event and a non-simulated real place for each object where each object conducts the detected activity event. The combination of Toomey and Boulanger cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested these features.

At the outset, the Office Action does not support an obviousness rejection because it does not address the above-recited features of claims 1 and 19. To support an obviousness rejection, the Examiner must articulate explicit reasoning as to why the claimed subject matter would have been obvious (see, e.g., MPEP §2141). The Office Action improperly ignores this feature of claims 1 and 19.

Furthermore, the disclosures of Toomey and Boulanger, individually or in combination, cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the above-recited features. Toomey, at col. 6, lines 49-54, teaches only that, during the meeting, as shown in Fig. 3, each

-10-

utterance 1005 is displayed by the appropriate user's interface as a cartoon-styled balloon emanating from that user's avatar and the text of the utterance is saved, along with its associated user identity and time stamp. Toomey fails to disclose or suggest relating the activity event detected to a place where each object conducts the detected activity event. Boulanger fails to remedy this shortfall of Toomey.

For at least these reasons, the combination of Toomey and Boulanger cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combinations of all of the features positively recited in claims 1 and 19.

Independent claim 2, and in like manner claim 20, recites among other features, an activity event control device that saves a link to another object that conducts the detected activity event together, in association with each object. The combination of Toomey and Boulanger cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested this feature.

The Office Action, on page 3, asserts that Toomey, at col. 6, lines 5-21 and lines 55-65, teaches the claimed activity event control device. Toomey actually teaches that meeting events are captured, i.e., recorded, into the multi-modal document 105. Toomey teaches that this multi-modal document 105 includes several tracks of information, including text inputs, audio queues, such as, for example, pre-recorded sound files, graphic representations of participants, such as, for example, avatars, props, the scene, such as, for example, the room and the background, documents created are provided by the participants and white-board drawings created by the participants. Toomey also teaches that capturing the meeting involves time-stamping and recording the meeting events, where each event is a change to one or more of these tracks. However, Toomey does not teach or suggest that capturing the events includes the feature an activity event control device that saves a link to another object that conducts the detected activity event together, in association with each object. Boulanger fails to remedy this shortfall of Toomey. As such, the combination of

-11-

Toomey and Boulanger cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the claimed activity event control device recited in claims 2 and 20.

Furthermore, the combination of Toomey and Boulanger cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested a display device that specifies objects conducting the respective saved activity events, and displays a symbol representing each activity event and symbols representing the specified objects which conduct each activity event, as recited in claims 2 and 20. The Office Action, on page 3, asserts that Toomey teaches the claimed display device. However, Toomey, in Fig. 3, discloses only the utterance 1005 that represents speaking of the avatar 1010. The utterance 1005 is conducted only by the right side avatar 1010. Importantly, there is no avatar conducting the utterance 1005 together with the right-side avatar 1010. As such, Toomey does not teach or suggest the feature displays a symbol representing each activity event and symbols representing the specified objects which conduct each activity event, as recited in claim 2.

Boulanger fails to remedy the above-identified shortfalls of Toomey. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the combination of Toomey and Boulanger cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combinations of all of the features positively recited in claims 2 and 20.

Independent claim 11 recites, among other features, an object history saving device that, upon detection of the activity event, saves the detected activity event for each object conducting the detected activity event and saves a link to another object that conducts the detected activity event together, in association with each object. Claim 11 also recites a display device that specifies objects conducting the respective saved activity events, and displays a symbol representing each activity event and symbols representing the specified objects which conduct each activity event. For reasons similar to those discussed above with

respect to claim 2, the combination of Toomey and Boulanger cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested these features.

Independent claim 13 recites, among other features, a saving device, wherein whenever the detecting device detects the activity event conducted by first and second objects of the objects, a saving device saves the detected activity event in association with the first object and saves a link to the second object in association with the first object. For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 2, the combination of Toomey and Boulanger cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested these features.

Independent claim 15 recites, among other features, an acquiring device that acquires information of activity events of one object from a memory, which saves the activity events conducted by the respective objects in the work space including at least one non-simulated real space and saves links to the respective objects conducting the respective activity events. Claim 15 also recites a displaying device that displays a symbol representing each activity event of the one object, a symbol representing the one object and a symbol representing another object that conducts each activity event together. For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 2, the combination of Toomey and Boulanger cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested these features.

Independent claim 16 recites, among other features, whenever the activity event is detected, save the detected activity event in association with the detected first object and save a link to the second object in association with the first object. For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 2, the combination of Toomey and Boulanger cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested these features.

Independent claim 18 recites, among other features, saves links to the respective objects conducting the respective activity events; and displaying a symbol representing each activity event of the one object, a symbol representing the one object and a symbol

-13-

representing another object that conducts each activity event together. For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 2, the combination of Toomey and Boulanger cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested these features.

Independent claim 21 recites, among other features, saving a link to another object that conducts the detected activity event in association with each object conducting the detected activity event. Claim 21 also recites displaying symbols representing the plurality saved activity events of one object in a time series manner simultaneously. For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 2, the combination of Toomey and Boulanger cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested these features.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the combinations of Toomey and Boulanger cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combinations of disclosed features positively recited in at least independent claims 1, 2, 11, 13, 15, 16 and 18-21. Further, claims 3-10 also would not have been suggested by the combination of the applied references for at least the respective dependence of these claims directly or indirectly on an allowable base claim, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-13, 15, 16 and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the asserted combination of applied references are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-13, 15, 16 and 18-21 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Timothy S. Smith
Registration No. 58,355

JAO:TSS/hms

Date: December 18, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461